

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, and 9. Reconsideration and re-examination of pending claims 1-10 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicant has amended the claim accordingly.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bhide (U.S. Patent No. 5,852,717). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 calls out a second computer having a proxy data store and acting as a proxy for a third computer. By contrast, the network access equipment of Bhide is not a proxy server and does not include a proxy memory store. In fact, Bhide repeatedly distinguishes between the network access equipment and a proxy server to which it may link. Thus, there is no teaching, suggestion, or description in Bhide of a second computer that acts as a proxy server and includes a proxy data store.

Claims 2-7 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhide (U.S. Patent No. 5,852,717) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pepe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,673,322). Applicant respectfully disagrees. With respect to the claims dependent on claim 1, those claims are allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding independent claim 4 and associated dependent claims 4-7, the Examiner is incorrect in stating that the combination of Bhide and Pepe teaches the claimed invention. For example, Bhide does not teach a second proxy computer. Instead, Bhide teaches network access equipment described as simply a remote access server. Further, Bhide repeatedly distinguishes between the network access server and a proxy server. Bhide fails to even once refer to an element as a proxy server while noting other elements specifically identified as proxy servers. It would not be proper to construe Bhide in any other manner than its plain and direct meaning.

Claims 8-10 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,673,322) as further in view of Bhide (U.S. Patent No. 5,852,717). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

With regard to independent claim 8, Pepe does not teach, suggest, or describe downloading installation files from a website to configure the user computer. With regard to

Application No. 10/071,947
Amendment. Dated September 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2005

independent claim 9, neither Bhide nor Pepe teach the second proxy computer as described in the claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest and *bona fide* effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all of claims 1-10 is believed to be in order, and a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due with the submission of this paper. However, if the Applicant is mistaken, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees from Deposit Account No. 502811.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-8300. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

J.D. Harriman II
Reg. No. 31,967
Customer Number 30076

Brown Raysman Millstein Felder & Steiner LLP
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1200
Los Angeles, California 90067-1621

Date: December 9, 2005